

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 11, 2006. Claims 1 to 3, 5, 6, 11 and 12 are in the application, of which Claims 1 and 11 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Turning first to a formal matter, U.S. Patent 6,755,516 (Hanson), over which all claims were rejected, is not now formally of record. It is respectfully requested for the Examiner to make the Hanson patent formally of record, such as by listing it on a form PTO-892. This is a second request.

Turning to the merits of the Office Action, Claims 1 to 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the patent to Hanson in view of U.S. Patent 6,431,681 (Hatasu). In response, the subject matter of dependent Claim 4 has been added to each of the independent claims herein, with additional amendments so as to define the positioning of a liquid supply outlet at a bottom of the liquid container. Accordingly, this should be viewed as a traversal of the rejection of those claims, as explained in more detail below.

The invention concerns a liquid container in which a projection is provided on only one lateral side of a pair of lateral sides of the liquid container's body, wherein the projection is guided when the container is mounted to a container holder along an upper end of a guide wall provided in the container holder, while the other lateral side is limited by an inner surface of the container holder. Correspondingly, a liquid supply outlet of the liquid container is disposed at a position downstream of a middle point of the liquid container with respect to the insertion direction, wherein the position is offset toward the lateral side provided with the projection.

By virtue of these cooperative structures, and by virtue of the positioning of the liquid supply outlet, the liquid supply outlet is correctly positioned during guided mounting of the container to the holder.

In entering the rejection over Hanson in view of Hatasa, the Office Action took the position that Hanson's projection 40 guided one side of Hanson's container body, while the other lateral side thereof was limited by an inner surface of Hanson's container holder 14. See Office Action, page 2, last lines. Applicants respectfully disagree. It is clear from Hanson's disclosure that Hanson provides a pair of opposed projections 40, one on each side of container body 12, which cooperate with a pair of guide rails 46, each provided on opposed sides of container holder 14. Thus, it is incorrect to state that Hanson guides one side of container body 12 with projection 40, whereas the opposed side is limited by an inner surface of the container holder 14.

The Office Action further took the position that it would have been obvious to modify Hanson, so as to eliminate one of its projections 40, based on the disclosure of Hatasa. Again, Applicants respectfully disagree. Even if it would have been obvious to modify Hanson based on Hatasa, so as to eliminate one of Hanson's projections 40, then there would not be any teaching as to the correct manner for guiding the lateral side that lacked the projection. In particular, the modification proposed by the Office Action would result in one side of Hanson being guided by a projection, with the side lacking the projection being completely unguided.

Moreover, relative to the amended claim language which provides for the positioning of the ink supply outlet, even the proposed combination of Hanson and Hatasa would not have disclosed or suggested the proper positioning of the ink supply outlet relative to the projection. As such, the hypothetical combination of Hanson and Hatasa would not obtain the advantageous effects of the present invention, wherein the

cooperative structure and positioning of the liquid supply outlet yield an effective connection of the ink supply outlet during guided mounting of the liquid container.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein define subject matter that would not have been obvious from any permissible combination of Hanson and Hatasa, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Michael K. O'Neill

Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 118436v1